## REMARKS

Claims 66-85 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the clause "each graphical user interface to include content related to the products or services of a particular retail vendor, the content customized, at least in part, based on said information and not to include advertising for another retail vendor" was alleged to be unsupported because "the specification does not teach each graph user interface to include content related to the products or services of a particular retail vendor and not to include advertising for another retail vendor." Office Action at page 2.

Apparently the basis for this objection is that "each" is read as meaning every interface that ever appears on the screen must be so configured. The claim calls for receiving a plurality of graphical user interfaces and then goes on to say each graphical user interface. Necessarily, each graphical user interface relates to the asserted plurality. Claim 66 has been amended to make this clear.

Claim 71 is objected to as having a lack of antecedent basis. But the graphical user interface is not claimed and, therefore, need not have an antecedent basis. The claim is a method claim involving use of a graphical user interface. Therefore, there is no antecedent basis issue.

With respect to the objection to claim 71 and the language activity graphical user interface without content from other unrelated retail vendors, it is asked if the applicant intended to claim that the interface to include content from others. The claim is directed to not including content from other related retail vendors in the activity graphical user interface. It is believed that the claim is clear.

On page 4 of the office action it is indicated that "said selection graphical user interface other than said activity graphical user interface and said sign in graphical user interface" is unclear. The claim has been clarified.

With respect to the objection to claim 81, the claim has been amended to overcome the issue.

Reconsideration is requested of the prior art rejection of claim 66. It is asserted that BISYS teaches that the content is customized based on information and not including content from another retail vendor. The claim specifically requires receiving a plurality of graphical user interfaces, each of that plurality including content related to the products or services of a

6

particular retail vendor and the content being customized based on the information received from the client. This simply does not happen in BISYS.

Further, it is asserted that BISYS teaches preventing the identified customer from using Internet services through said service provider without first viewing, in sequence, three graphical user interfaces from said plurality. There is nothing of the sort described in the FirstLinq. There is no discussion of the initial user interfaces and no suggestion that the customer is prevented from doing anything.

The suggestion that customizing the next interface after the sign in interface is inherent should be reconsidered. In order to be inherent, the thing must be necessarily present. See M.P.E.P. § 2112. There is no reason why this is so here. The allegation that "Internet service providers, such as AOL, have been doing this for years" is noted, but is irrelevant. Please note that the application was filed in 2000, which is more than a few years. No cited reference teaches this feature. To the extent it is asserted that such a thing is well known, the Examiner should cite a reference since there is no reason to believe that it was well known in 2000, when the present application was filed.

To the extent it is suggested on page 6, that anything in the cited material in Rangan teaches customizing the content in a plurality of graphical user interfaces to include content related to products and services of a particular vendor customized based on input information about the customer's preferences, reconsideration is requested. There is nothing in Figure 2 about the products or services of a particular vendor, nor anything that is customized based on such information. All there is is a list of websites and the associated user name.

It is also noted that Rangan teaches a log in interface before user accessing the Internet and modifying the interface based on a selection made in a prior interface. This does not correspond to providing a customer identifier, together with information about identified preferences, and has nothing to do with providing a plurality of graphical user interfaces related to the products of a particular retail vendor, customized based on the information about the identified customer's preferences. All the material at lines 18-50 talks about is the customized interface to include user configured URLs. This still does not correspond to what is claimed. In other words, all the reference teaches is that the user can bookmark web pages and get them later. It does not talk about receiving information about the identified customer's preferences and using that information to select products or services of a particular retail vendor. In other words,

7

the claim calls for content customized based on information. That content must be related to the products or services of the particular retail vendor. There are no products or services or any customization of products or services in the list of web pages. Most certainly, it is not limited to the services of one retail vendor, but, clearly, covers a number of different websites. Thus, the cited reference simply teaches away.

The suggestion that it would be obvious to provide a login and password page, as in Rangan, so users could securely access the Internet is noted, but it is not commensurate with the claim language.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* rejection is not made out because there is no receiving of a plurality of graphical user interfaces customized with content related products or services of a particular retail vendor, the customization based on the information about the identified customer's preferences and not including advertising for any other retail vendor.

Claim 71 was rejected over Rangan and BISYS as well. It is suggested that customizing "content for a graphical user interface; current user's recorded user input and the product or services of a particular vendor" is shown in Figure 2, abstract, and column 5, lines 17-67 and column 7, line 50 to column 8, line 23, and column 9, lines 18-50. As described above, Rangan is silent on each of these points. To the extent the listing of web pages could be called content, it is not customized based on information received from the user and it is not limited to content related to products or services and, further, it is not limited to the products or services of a particular vendor.

BISYS does not overcome this deficiency.

The suggestion (office action at page 8) that it would be obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention for Rangan to use the virtual Internet service provider of BISYS to provide Internet service for the reasons disclosed in BISYS, even if true, does not meet the limitations of the claims. Further, the allegation that Rangan teaches providing Internet services to known users of the processor-based system is also noted, but, again, does not meet the claimed limitations.

The claim calls for a sign in graphical user interface having different indicators for each known user of the particular processor-based system. The indicator must be selectable because the claim says: in response to selection of an indicator, identifying a current user. There is no reason to believe that the indicators allegedly taught in Figure 2 of Rangan are selectable. Note

8

that the one for two names, John/Jane Doe, even if selectable, could not select one or the other of the two. Moreover, there is simply no reason to presume that these names are selectable.

Finally, the claim calls for customizing content based on the current user and the recorded user inputs and the products or services of a particular retail vendor. This is not taught in any of the cited references. A selection graphical user interface that is different from the activity graphical user interface and the sign in graphical user interface is not suggested in any of the cited references.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2008

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

9